

Illinois U Library

OCTOBER 21, 1952

737th BROADCAST

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast by 300 Stations of the ABC Radio Network



U. S. Pat. Off.

Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

What Are the Real Differences Between the Candidates?

Moderator, ORVILLE HITCHCOCK

Speakers

J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

VAL PETERSON



NOTICE!

—No Town Meeting November 4—

Listen for Election Returns
Over ABC

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 36, N.Y.

VOLUME 18, NUMBER 23



\$5.00 A YEAR, 15c A COPY



Town Meeting

VOL. 18

No. 23



What Are the Real Differences Between the Candidates?

The Broadcast of October 21, 1952, from 9:00 to 9:45 p.m., EST, over the American Broadcasting Company Radio Network, originated from the Township High School, Joliet, Illinois, under the auspices of the "World Today" series of Joliet Junior College.

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of views presented.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

HON. VAL PETERSON—Governor of Nebraska, was born in Oakland, Neb., in 1903. He obtained his B. A. degree from Wayne State Teachers College and an M. A. from the University of Nebraska. For the next few years he was a teacher. Later, he bought the Elgin (Neb.) *Review*, and as a newspaper man, he gradually became active in political affairs. In 1941 he became Secretary to Gov. Dwight Griswold, resigning the next year to enter the Armed Services. Gov. Peterson spent 44 months with the Air Force and he held the rank of lieutenant colonel. He was elected Governor of Nebraska in 1946 and re-elected in 1948 and 1950. Gov. Peterson has been a persistent advocate of debt-free, pay-as-you-go government in Nebraska, and has been a leader in the program for maximum development of land and water resources in the Missouri Valley Basin. He now serves as Chairman of the Missouri River States Committee, representing the ten mid-continent states, and is a member of the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee. He is a member of the Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference.

SEN. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT—Democrat of Arkansas, member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Banking and Currency Committee. Following his graduation from George Washington University Law School (LL. B.) in 1934, Mr. Fulbright, a former Rhodes scholar, took a position in the anti-trust division of the Department of Justice. He then served as instructor in law at George Washington University and the University of Arkansas from 1935 to 1939, when at the age of 34 he was elected president of the University of Arkansas. In 1942 he was elected Congressman from Arkansas, and in 1945, he entered the U. S. Senate. Soon after entering Congress, he won nationwide attention with the "Fulbright Resolution" passed in 1943, calling for an international organization to maintain the peace. He is also known for his sponsorship of the exchange of students legislation and the proposal of a federation of European nations.

Moderator: **ORVILLE HITCHCOCK**—Professor of Speech at State University of Iowa.

Town Meeting is published weekly at 32 S. Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio, by The Town Hall, Inc., New York 36, New York. Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, New York 36, N.Y.

Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, (Canada, \$6.00); six months, \$3.00, (Canada, \$3.50); eight weeks, \$1.00, (Canada, \$1.20); 15c a single copy. Entered as second-class matter May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Copyright, 1952, BY THE TOWN HALL, INC.

What Are the Real Differences Between the Candidates?

Announcer:

Town Meeting tonight originates from Joliet, Illinois, where we are the guests of Joliet Junior College, the oldest public Junior College in America. We are broadcasting from the auditorium of Joliet Township High School as a feature of the "World Today" series conducted by the Junior College. Joliet is the center of a great farming and industrial area just to the south of Chicago, where schools were established almost as soon as white settlers began making their homes here. The community has always taken pride in its leadership on the educational scene, and Joliet Junior College which celebrated its 50th anniversary last month has since its inception been concerned primarily with the needs of the people of the immediate area.

As early as 1901, post graduate courses were offered to students interested in liberal arts and sciences. Over the years, thousands of graduates have attributed their opportunity for higher education to the foresighted citizens of Joliet Township who founded the Junior College. Now to preside as moderator for tonight's discussion, here is Dr. Orville Hitchcock, Professor of Speech at the State University of Iowa.

Moderator Hitchcock:

Good evening, friends. Tonight, Town Meeting originates in Joliet, Illinois, under the auspices of the "World Today" lecture and discussion series of Joliet Junior College, in the Township High School. two weeks from tonight, you and I will be listening to our radios, getting the first results of

the 1952 elections. On that day, along with a record number of our fellow citizens, we will have voted for President of the United States, in an important election in a critical period. The campaign has now progressed far enough to give us an opportunity to size up the candidates, to get to know them as people, as personalities, and to see where they stand or have failed to take a stand on issues which affect us and our country.

So tonight we ask: "What Are the Real Differences Between the Candidates?" What have we learned about them as individuals and as political leaders? What do we know of their temperaments and aptitudes and their ideas? To help us think through these and other questions, we have on the platform here in Joliet two distinguished political figures, Senator J. William Fulbright, Democrat of Arkansas, member of the Senate Foreign Relations and Banking and Currency committees, and Governor Val Peterson, Republican of Nebraska, Chairman of the Missouri Basin States Committee and member of the Executive Committee of the Governors' Conference. I think we might begin by turning to Senator Fulbright here. What, Senator, now would you say are the real differences between the two candidates?

Senator Fulbright:

Well, Mr. Hitchcock, there are many differences between Governor Stevenson and General Eisenhower. Stevenson was chosen by the Democratic Convention as the Democrat best qualified for the Presidency. General Eisenhower was chosen simply because the Re-

publican Convention thought he could win. That Convention really wanted Taft. It thought him the best qualified Republican for the President. He was rejected for the General, not because the General was qualified, but because he is popular. If the voters want a popular president, the General is their man. If they want a qualified president, Adlai Stevenson is their man.

It is a plain fact that Governor Stevenson, by long training and experience coupled with native wit and intelligence, is thoroughly qualified to be a competent and probably a great president of the United States. In contrast to Governor Stevenson's lifetime of experience in the practice of the law and in civil government, General Eisenhower has spent his life in the regular Army of the United States as a professional soldier. Can anyone seriously believe that a professional soldier, with no experience in civil government or actual acquaintance with the domestic problems of the people, is qualified to make a competent president of the United States? Our experience with professional soldiers in the Presidency is not reassuring on any score.

General Grant, a fine soldier and an honest man, had what is generally conceded to be the most disgraceful administration in our history. As one of our foremost historians summed up the Grant regime, "The American people learned the hard way that the best way to unfit a man for the Presidency is to bring him up a soldier." But in addition to our dismal experience with professional soldiers, surely one can hardly question the fact that the day-to-day existence of the professional soldier, apart from the ordinary civilian life of the people, a life

regulated to the smallest detail by a rigid and formal code of conduct, is not an experience calculated to produce the understanding, the patience and the power of persuasion so essential to a leader of a free people. The reflexes, the attitude, the approach to life of the soldier are directly the opposite of that of the statesman.

The good soldier obeys orders or he gives orders. He expects or he gives unquestioning obedience. He has little opportunity to develop either a questioning mind or the power of persuasion. His is a life almost automatic in its regularity with every action and every need provided for by the regulations. I cannot believe that a man with such a background has even an outside chance of making a successful president. It seems superfluous for me to add that the traditional training post for many of our most successful presidents has been the Governorship of our great states. Need I remind you that Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, both Theodore and Franklin Roosevelt, and many others were governors of their states before they became truly great presidents? Finally, one very important difference is that Adlai Stevenson, like Abraham Lincoln, is from the great state of Illinois. (*Applause*)

Dr. Hitchcock:

Thank you, Senator Fulbright. Now, Governor Peterson, will you come in and tell us what you think are the real differences between the two candidates?

Governor Peterson:

Indeed I will, and it's eternally amazing to me how a man who could be so popular with the Democrats just a few months ago could now have developed certain deficiencies that appeared to be pointed out by the distinguished

Senator from Arkansas tonight. There has been some change, apparently, in the climate of America. I should like to suggest, too, very briefly, that two of the greatest presidents in the history of the United States were very nearly professional military men — certainly professional in the era in which they lived and also two of the finest presidents we ever had in the history of America.

I refer to Washington, who was in the militia of the Colony of Virginia from the time that he was a young boy, 14 or 15 years of age, and served in the military with great distinction and with great pleasure throughout his entire life. I refer also to that great Democrat who has been repudiated by some of the modern Democrats (along with Jefferson)—that great Democrat, Jackson, who in my judgment was another good president of the United States. He never missed an opportunity to participate in any kind of quarrel—in or out of the military and who was a great military leader in America.

In addition to that, 11 other generals have been presidents. But a reason, I think, that General Eisenhower should be the next President of the United States, some of the reasons are these: First, he is an exceptional administrator. In handling the crusade in Europe, his job was primarily an administrative job. He handled the biggest administrative job in the history of the world and he handled it flawlessly and in a manner that commanded the plaudits of all the peoples of the world—a big job of assembling the right supplies in the right numbers, in the right places, at the right time, and starting those armies to work, and following the crusade in Europe.

At the suggestion of, at the invitation of, a Democratic President

he went over and established the NATO organization and there established himself as one of the great inspirational leaders of all times, taking a dispirited people, who were bitter after having seen their best men killed in two great world wars, and enthusing them with a determination to stand up against the common enemy of mankind — godless dictatorial Communism.

Here is a man whose breadth of experience as an administrator and as a great world leader is so much more tremendous than that of Governor Stevenson that there is utterly no comparison, and I am one who holds the Governorship in high repute. In addition to that, he knows the problems of the world as no man in the world knows them today. The Russians respect him and the Russians fear him, and in my judgment he is the best hope of peace for America in our time.

In addition to that, he is a free man. He is not Harry's boy. Neither is he Jake Arvey's product. He is a man who can clean out the mess in Washington, and there is an unholy mess, even as Governor Stevenson has said in writing to the Editor of the Portland Journal. He can restore common woodshed honesty in government, eliminate the softness toward Communism that has characterized our government at home for many years, and deal more firmly with them abroad.

But more important than all of these things, he came from a humble, a good but poverty stricken family. He learned the discipline of work as a boy; he learned the value of a dollar; he learned the dignity of human labor. He comes with no silver-spoon background. His family didn't hand him money; he went out and created it; he fought his way up. He

has the common touch, and he's the man who in my judgment can bring prosperity to America without basing it upon war, which is simply a means of death and destruction and the spilling of American blood all over the world.

Dr. Hitchcock: Now both of you gentlemen apparently agree that the professional background of the candidates is important, although when it comes to talking about the specific background of General Eisenhower or Governor Stevenson you disagree. Would you like to explore that a little more, Senator Fulbright? What about this matter of the training of the two candidates?

Senator Fulbright: Well, first, I don't think we ought to rewrite history just to prove a point in this election. It's quite clear that General, as he called him, General Washington, was not a professional soldier. He never attended West Point or anything similar. He had no formal training.

Governor Peterson: There was no West Point at that time. (*Applause*)

Senator Fulbright: That's correct. The only training of a military nature he had was from a couple of deserting British officers who gave him a few instructions in manual arms. He was no more a professional military man than the 15 million GI's in this country who serve their country. He was primarily a leader; he was a politician, if you like; he was a member of the House of Burgesses. He learned the hard way, having been defeated two or three times in his efforts to be elected to the House of Burgesses, which was, of course, the highest political body in Virginia at the time. He was an aristocrat, if you like. You brought up General Washington. I'd never

thought that it was necessary that one must be born poor. I mean it happens that they may be poor or rich.

This country is very prosperous today, and many people aspire to office, but in any case I definitely deny that General Washington or President Washington was a professional soldier. Neither was Jackson. Jackson was Governor of his state, a judge and a leader of men, and, of course, in emergencies as millions of our own people do today they join the army and serve their country. They were not professional soldiers; they did not live apart from the civilians of their day in army camps and follow the army military regime.

We have had three men who were professional soldiers. Grant was the only one who served out a full term. He served two terms. The others were Zachary Taylor who served a little over a year and Harrison who served, I think, only a month—none of the others which we call Generals. Of course, they served as we served, but that is in this conception. I think it is a complete perversion of the truth to say that we had these professional soldiers—Jackson and Washington.

Dr. Hitchcock: Part of our disagreement here seems to be over the definition of professional soldier, over military training, military background. Do you want to say something more on that?

Governor Peterson: I certainly do. Senator Fulbright knows perfectly well, because he's an astute student of American history and of life generally, knows perfectly well that at the time that Washington lived, and at the time that Jackson lived, and even up to the Civil War we didn't have specialization in America, specialized training. Lawyers read law for a few weeks

in somebody's office as Abraham Lincoln did and made a pretty fair lawyer and the same thing was true of military men. We didn't have professional schools at that time.

I said very carefully in my comment, and I trust the Senator noted it, that they were as professional as men could be professional in their time. They devoted a great deal of their time to serving in the military, and I think a close examination of American history will show that Washington spent about as much time, as much time, I'll say, in military affairs as he did in any other single pursuit other than agriculture, because he was basically a farmer of course.

Senator Fulbright: Quite correct.

Governor Peterson: As well as being a politician.

Senator Fulbright: He was a farmer and a politician. I agree to that entirely. And there's a great difference in my view as to how much one knows about agriculture whether he's a farmer or whether he's an army captain in a post off in some isolated . . .

Governor Peterson: I would suggest that any student of military affairs will find that Washington did a pretty good job of handling his army, and I would also suggest that this man Jackson did a pretty good job. He licked the professionals of Europe down in New Orleans and he licked the Indians who were not beginners in the art of warfare and licked them on many occasions.

Senator Fulbright: Well, the Governor misses the point. I'm not belittling their abilities as leaders of men. They certainly were, but they were not professional soldiers. Jackson was Governor, a Representative in Congress, a politician if you like, a judge primarily, just

as the Governor of Nebraska is today. I don't understand why he can take this position about the politicians—that people trained in the art of government are unfit for the Presidency.

Dr. Hitchcock: Gentlemen, I wonder if . . .

Governor Peterson: I didn't take that position, and the Governor understands the point perfectly that the attempt of the Democratic party at this time to cut General Eisenhower down simply because he's serving his country with distinction as a soldier which, I think, is a very small attitude. (*Applause*)

Dr. Hitchcock: Gentlemen, I think maybe we should have quit about three minutes ago when we were in agreement here almost for a minute. We should have quit while we were ahead. But we do have lots of other issues to talk about and couldn't we say that we leave that for a minute? Could I . . .

Senator Fulbright: Mr. Hitchcock, I don't like to leave it there in that last one. There is no effort on my part or any Democrat to cut General Eisenhower down. The Democrats in this government . . .

Governor Peterson: Then you haven't heard from Harry lately, I don't suppose. (*Laughter*) As a matter of fact your relations aren't too good with him anyway, are they, basically?

Senator Fulbright: Well, Mr. Truman is not running for the Presidency. I thought this meeting was to try to discuss in some rational manner the issues. Now if it's merely a rabble-rousing meeting to boo people, I don't see that there's any purpose in making a discussion of it. (*Applause*)

Governor Peterson: I don't think that point is too well taken.

Dr. Hitchcock: May I interject a

word here? We do have a limited time. We have only 45 minutes and we do have a number of aspects to consider and we seem to have reached a stalemate on this particular point, but you have brought up another point that I think we might profitably explore. You mentioned a moment ago that some people looked upon Stevenson as Harry's boy. I've noticed that both candidates have been referred to as "captive candidates" — one the captive of the old guard in the Republican party, the other captive of the Truman Administration, the Truman people in the Democratic party. Now is that an issue, gentlemen? Is there a real difference there between the candidates? Is that something that we should talk about? It's come into what we've said before here very briefly. Senator Fulbright, would you like to . . .

Senator Fulbright: Well, I think those slogans and the effort to apply labels to people is a very erroneous way to approach these problems. That I don't think is the right way to look at it. It still comes back in my mind to the essential characteristics of these two men. Now I must say that it isn't my intention to cut down in any sense General Eisenhower's reputation or all that he merits as a great soldier. I was merely trying to make the point that he has had no experience in civil administration. Now, if that is not so, I'm willing to be corrected.

But his plain history is that at the age of 21 he entered West Point and for the next succeeding 40 odd years I think he's been in the military. It was certainly nothing disgraceful; he had the most honorable and highly successful career in that. This country, including the Democratic administration, gave him the greatest honors.

He was Chief of Staff. Nobody denies that, and nobody is trying to cast any reflections upon his ability as a military leader, but that isn't the question that I thought was under consideration.

It's the Presidency of the United States which is traditionally, after all, a civilian position. Don't let anyone think (and I think the Governor will agree) that government, whether it be of a state, a city or this nation, is not a very complex matter. It's a difficult matter. It isn't something that you just walk into over night, and you know. Generally it requires training, and the traditional way to train them is as Governor of a state. Most of our successful presidents, I think, the ones with real success have been, have had such training. That's the only point I make and it in no way reflects upon the honor or the success of General Eisenhower as a military man.

Dr. Hitchcock: Thank you, Senator, for pinning down that point. Now would you like to pin down your side?

Governor Peterson: Senator, I pointed out, and I thought rather clearly, that General Eisenhower had handled two of the biggest administrative undertakings in the history of the world.

Senator Fulbright: They were military.

Governor Peterson: Now just a minute. Today you cannot separate from a military undertaking the business aspects or the political aspects of that undertaking. His experience in my judgment, and I served my country in this last war for some four years, and I've served as a governor for six years and been elected as Governor three times in my state—a state much smaller than Illinois in population,

but one with the same problems. My judgment is, and I don't disparage the office of Governor at all, but my impression is and my judgment is that Eisenhower handled problems on a much bigger scale, much more involved, much more diverse, much more intricate than the Governor of Illinois has handled down in Springfield, and I cast no aspersions on the Governor of Illinois. I want to say this quickly that I think he's an intelligent man and I think he's a man of integrity.

Senator Fulbright: Well, I don't deny the magnitude of the operation in Europe, but let's analyze its character. General Eisenhower was the Commander. He received orders from the combined Chiefs-of-Staff sitting in Washington, the chief member of which was George Marshall, the man who gave him his position, selected him for it. They set the policy and he did administer those, as any commander in the field would. He did a good job; he did not make the over-all policy. Anyone knows that. He was a good administrator of orders, directions handed to him by the combined Chiefs-of-Staff. I've no criticism of the way he carried out the particular job he had to do. It's the character of the job. It has no relation to the administration of the affairs of either a great state like Illinois or of the United States of America—the administration of a military policy. I can see no real close association or relation between the two.

Governor Peterson: Senator, you simplify the matter way too much. A modern command in these days of warfare is entirely more intricate than you indicated tonight.

Dr. Hitchcock: Gentlemen, may I ask this? You've been spending a lot of time on this point. Do you

think that this is one of the major points over which the American people are going to make up their minds come November 4? Is this the main question we're going to ask ourselves?

Senator Fulbright: Mr. Hitchcock, in my opinion it is *the* question overshadowing any other question. You can take any of these issues which become so alive in various sections affecting individual groups of people according to their economic interests and nearly every one of them are transient issues. They may be here today, and next year or the year following they are entirely different. Times change and there is a shifting. I don't blame people who go into office and then two or three years later people say you didn't do what you said in substantive legislation, because the times do change.

As you know, the all-important question is the over-all ability and experience of a man to meet the type of problems involved in government. That is the thing. It is, after all, his character. We agree. I certainly agree that both of these men are honorable men, honest men with proper purposes. This business that gets off about suspicion about what they do in some minor detail interests me not at all; it's this over-all experience to meet the difficult and very complex problems of this country that interests me. It is *the* issue, as I see it.

Dr. Hitchcock: Well, gentlemen, do you want to make just one statement?

Governor Peterson: Yes, I couldn't agree with that interpretation at all. I think there are other issues in this campaign that are much more important than that. One of them that Adlai Stevenson is taking recognition of is

the fact that the American people think that it's time for a change down in Washington. That it's time to clean out the crooks and the incompetents who have mismanaged America in the last 20 years, if you please. I think there are many issues in this campaign that are more important than the one that the Senator enunciates here tonight.

Senator Fulbright: Well, wait on that point. There's no issue about a change. Two weeks from today, there's going to be a change. There's no question about it. How can you make an issue over that? It'll be Stevenson or Eisenhower. It will not be Truman. That ought to be clear. (*Applause*)

Governor Peterson: That won't be a change when Adlai Stevenson is a creature of Harry Truman and of Jacob Arvey. (*Applause*)

Senator Fulbright: That is not so. I was at the convention and I know more about it than you do. If there ever was a draft of all the people of that convention it was at this convention.

Dr. Hitchcock: Now gentlemen, we have a lot of questions that the people in the audience are getting ready to ask and our time is going pretty fast. Also every week on Town Meeting we ask a question which has been submitted in advance by one of our listeners and considered the most timely and pertinent by our program staff. To the listener who sends in the most appropriate question each week, we send a complete 20 volume set of the American People's Ency-

clopedia. Please keep your question within 25 words, write it on a post card and for next week's program, mail it not later than October 24, Friday midnight, to Town Meeting Questions, New York 36, New York. At the close of the program we'll tell you about next week's topic.

This week Mr. Richmond J. Bartlett, 203 Cedar Avenue, West Peoria, Illinois, receives a set of the American People's Encyclopedia for submitting the following question—and, gentlemen, I'd like to ask you to consider this question, if you will, before we take questions from the people who are gathering to ask them in the audience. "Are the differences between the candidates as important as the differences between the parties in this election?" Governor Peterson, would you like to start with that question? Then we'll let Senator Fulbright deal with it for a minute.

Governor Peterson: I think that's one of those questions that doesn't really make too much sense. I think that the differences are equally important. The differences between the parties and the differences between the candidates.

Senator Fulbright: I think there are very serious differences between the parties and the candidates, I think that's correct, but we were discussing as I understood it this evening the candidates—their differences. If we go into the parties why we get onto a much broader subject. I think the differences are quite marked in both of those areas.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Hitchcock: Well, thank you, gentlemen, now I wonder if we could start with a lady in the aisle who has a question. We'll see if we can get at some of these issues that you said we needed to discuss, Governor Peterson.

Lady: Why do so many of those who have prospered during the last 20 years think they want a change, a change back to 1932 unemployment, bread lines, etc.?

Governor Peterson: I take it that question was directed to me. The ghost of Herbert Hoover is to walk again. I'd like to suggest to you (and I think this is an utterly fair statement) that the prosperity which we have in America tonight is a blood prosperity based upon death and destruction started at the time when the Japanese moved into China, or if you please the day that Adolf Hitler started raining bombs upon Poland.

I think one of the most despicable things in this campaign is that the President of the United States has the guts (if you'll pardon the word) to go around America bragging about the prosperity which we have here today when it's based upon death and upon destruction of millions of people all over the world, and it's a prosperity in which we've marked the prices of goods up every day since September, 1939. I say one of the most important issues in this campaign is the bankruptcy of the Democratic party which can't bring prosperity to America on any other basis than war or the preparation for war or the continuation of a war over in Korea. I notice 28 boys went out of this county today and that means that within the next few months a few coffins will

be shipped back into this county.
(Applause)

Mr. Hitchcock: Now we're ready to take more questions from our rather enthusiastic audience here at Joliet on a rather hotly debated issue that we're discussing tonight. I see a gentleman with a number one card which means that he has a question for Senator Fulbright. Yes, sir.

Man: Senator Fulbright, if war comes with Russia, don't you suppose that Stalin would prefer to have Stevenson in the White House rather than Eisenhower?

Senator Fulbright: Well, I think it is much less likely of course that war will come with Russia if you have Stevenson in the White House. I think he understands our foreign relations. By that I mean our political foreign relations which is that part of our government that we use as an instrument to prevent war—to settle our differences without war. I assume you mean that the General is a greater military man in the actual prosecution of war. I would agree to that, I'm perfectly willing to admit that he is a great general. He served us before. I see no reason why he wouldn't again as a general.

As a president I think that he has already evidenced in his uncertainty the constantly shifting views he has about important problems—his lack of knowledge of the domestic and foreign affairs. The inconsistent statements that he's made do not certainly indicate in my mind any deceptive shifting that he did on purpose, but he's found himself making statements without information and later being informed or told by different people. So he's had to shift.

The one thing that has amazed me is on a matter like universal military training. It's true that's an unpopular thing, but only a couple of years ago he was one of the principal witnesses before the Senate Committee—and this is a matter of record—in which he strongly urged it (he was the leading witness) because of its effectiveness and efficiency in providing for the defense of the country. But now that he's a candidate for political office, he's completely reversed it and followed a different line and is against it.

Now that can be developed. Similar changes can be developed in several fields—his attitude toward the Korean war, his attitude toward the appropriations for NATO. He was strongly against it and testified as such, wrote letters to Senator Connally, opposing cuts in the NATO appropriation. Now he says we're wasteful in all of those programs and he's against supporting them. He's going to cut the budget 40 billion dollars. Now I leave it to you if those are reasonable judgments on political matters.

Dr. Hitchcock: Governor, would you like to comment?

Governor Peterson: Senator, I'd like to suggest that Adlai has shifted a little bit during this campaign on a number of things. I should also like to suggest that I know that you wouldn't misrepresent anyone purposely, but General Eisenhower has not changed his views on universal military training. He made this statement, that under the present situation and with the draft acts in force universal military training was not practical. Now that's a lot different than saying that he changed his views with respect to universal military training. You

have to make statements in light of the frame of reference in which you are operating.

Senator Fulbright: Well, I just don't understand the English language, I guess. (*Applause*)

Dr. Hitchcock: Thank you, Senator. Now can we have a question from the lady on the left?

Lady: Governor Peterson, what plans have the Republicans for curbing inflation?

Governor Peterson: One of the first things we need to do is quit this business of spending money like drunken sailors all over the world. I'm one of those who have been in favor of extending military aid to certain countries in the world, of extending economic aid, but the fact of the matter is that we have wasted tremendous sums of money around the world. In addition to that we need some financial responsibility in our government. There's a limit to the taxes that you can heap upon the people of America. There's a limit to the things that we can do, even granting some of them are desirable. There's a limit to how big government can be although none in Washington seems to have been conscious of that in recent years.

In other words the Republicans would hope to bring financial responsibility and sanity back to America by cutting down the national debt, which is now up to 260 billions and will soon be 300; by balancing the budget, which the democrats have never been able to do; by handling money more carefully, just as the people handle their own money; by stopping this business of throwing money all around the world and by stopping this emphasis upon big government and carrying on the assumption that you can do

everything for the people by big government.

Dr. Hitchcock: Thank you, sir. Next question.

Man: Senator Fulbright, how do our allies feel about the differences between the two men?

Senator Fulbright: Well, I don't think it's significant how our allies feel about these men. I think it's our business to select the best man for the Presidency, and I have paid no particular attention to that. I think they have shifted, I understand, from one to the other and I am not qualified to give an opinion.

Dr. Hitchcock: Thank you. I see a lady who has a question for Governor Peterson, I think.

Lady: Governor Peterson, do you think that Eisenhower represents the segment of the Republican party which agrees with the foreign policy of the present administration?

Governor Peterson: I'm not concerned about whether any Republican agrees with any phase of the present administration. I'm concerned about whether the Republicans have the right ideas, and I think that Eisenhower has the right approach to the problems of the world. I believe that he will co-operate with free people in the world to fight against our common enemy—the communists of Russia. I believe that his ideas are sound and I am certain that they are the predominant ideas in the Republican party today as they will be in America after January.

Dr. Hitchcock: The gentleman in the right aisle.

Man: Senator Fulbright, I believe you are a former Rhodes Scholar. Assuming that the United States has now succeeded to the

former world role of a defunct Britain, how far must we still follow British policies and guidance?

Senator Fulbright: I suppose you learned that from the *Chicago Tribune*. They seem to take delight . . . (*Applause*) Their views on foreign policy I suppose have great currency in this part of the country. I think that's all a myth about following Great Britain. Great Britain has been a very great country in its time. No one, I think, should take much pleasure in seeing a great country lose the position that it held largely as a result of two wars. They are in many ways depleted. I still think they are a great people, but there is no question in anybody's mind, certainly least of all in Great Britain's, but that this country is the leader of the free peoples. The responsibility is upon us. That's why I'm really concerned as much as I am about the qualifications of the next president. It's because of the leadership of this country.

If we were a small, insignificant country like so many people in this country in the Republican party seem to wish, I see it wouldn't matter so much. We wouldn't be in such a vulnerable position, but it's extremely important for us to be led wisely and properly and with some initiative under the circumstances. To gloat about the difficulties of a country from which after all we have inherited our basic political institutions, many of our religious concepts, our common law, I think is in bad taste myself.

Dr. Hitchcock: I notice the audience was laughing because Governor Peterson was squirming a little in his chair. Maybe we should let him say a word here.

Governor Peterson: Well, I just think it's hardly becoming for Senator Fulbright to attempt to read the minds of the Republicans in America and to put ideas into their heads.

Senator Fulbright: I wish I could put some in their heads. (*Laughter*)

Governor Peterson: It would be the end of decency in government if you could put some of the ideas in their heads that have characterized that administration with which you are affiliated down in Washington the last few years.

Senator Fulbright: Well, now Governor, I spent two years investigating the RFC. I don't know about that; I think I did as much as any Republican in or out of the administration to try to bring back a higher standard of conduct in the government. One thing you overlook about it. The Democrats have taken the lead in our government in reform, if you like, or in cleaning up the conditions. All governments throughout history develop scandals of one sort or another. I dare say there's a little illegality going on in Omaha right now. (*Applause*) I mean the point is . . .

Governor Peterson: I would say that the Democrats would know where to find it all right because they know . . . (*Applause*)

Dr. Hitchcock: Could we call that an even exchange and take another question?

Man: Governor Peterson, are the rumors at some of the army camps that General Eisenhower has proposed part of the budgetary reductions be achieved by reduction of servicemen's pay true?

Governor Peterson: Why, they're absolutely false, and there'll be a lot more false rumors in the next

two weeks. I assume they maybe spread by both sides.

Senator Fulbright: Well, I happen to know that is not false. That is a statement, an official statement, that he made in Washington. It's been printed. I have a little copy of it somewhere. It is not a rumor at all; it's official testimony.

Dr. Hitchcock: While the Senator's hunting for the copy let's get another question.

Governor Peterson: That Eisenhower would cut the pay of the soldiers in America?

Senator Fulbright: He thought that the . . .

Governor Peterson: I deny it flatly.

Senator Fulbright: He thinks, and he stated so in the discussion before the committee on universal military training, that people—GI's as distinguished from professional soldiers—should serve without pay because they owe it as a patriotic debt.

Governor Peterson: Oh, you're taking something out of context, and you're making a propaganda statement.

Senator Fulbright: That is not so.

Dr. Hitchcock: Well, gentlemen, I can't answer it because I don't have the statement here, but could we have another question?

Man: Senator Fulbright, why did the Democrats, earlier, beckon Eisenhower as standard bearer if his record as professional soldier so disqualifies him for president?

Senator Fulbright: Well, you make an assumption which I don't know anything about other than individuals. I did not do it, and certainly no appreciable number did. There was no support for him in Chicago that I can recall

in any official way. Individual members of the party, of course, express themselves. I wouldn't presume to say that the Democratic party is unanimous in its views on anything any more than the Republican is. I have a high regard for him as a military man but I know nothing of a serious nature among the Democrats seeking to run General Eisenhower as a Democrat. That's all a myth. Your own junior Senator, as I recall, or maybe he's your senior senator, anyway, Senator Douglas, did make a statement that he would like for him to run as, I think, representing both parties. He wasn't speaking for the parties.

Dr. Hitchcock: Gentlemen, I'm sorry I do have to interrupt, because our time is gone. Thank you, Senator Fulbright and Governor Peterson, for your frank discussion of the election issues and the personalities. We hope you have helped many of our listeners decide how they will vote two weeks from today. It has been a pleasure for Town Meeting to be associated on this occasion with Joliet Junior College, and we wish to thank Dean E. W. Rowley and Miss Susan H. Wood, Assistant Dean, for their fine co-operation. So plan to be with us next week and every week at the sound of the Crier's Bell.



BEHIND THE CRIER'S BELL

While it is our hope that "Town Meeting of the Air" has become a familiar household term, we expect that fewer people around the country are aware of "Town Meeting" in print.

Bulletin readers may be interested to know that the last year or two has produced at least ten books which contain more than a passing reference to the program.* Most of these are college texts, which have put "Town Meeting" material to an interesting variety of uses.

In *Argumentation and Debate*, subtitled "Techniques of a Free Society," three speech professors have considered "the methods of bringing reasoned discourse to bear on personal and social problems for purposes of decision and action." The text they selected as effective argument on the air was our March 21, 1950, broadcast, "What Should We Do About Federal Aid to Education?" with Senator Scott Lucas and Dr. Lawrence Gould.

Readings for Opinion, by Professors Earle Davis and William C. Hummel of Kansas State College, makes use of content of a "Town Meeting" broadcast, rather than its technique. Designed for English students, this book deals with such diverse phenomena as college athletics, the atom bomb, motion pictures, "Americanism," and the comics. Under the latter heading, the authors printed the 1948 "Town Meeting" broadcast, "What's Wrong with the Comics?," in their words an "uproariously successful" evening with John Mason Brown and Al Capp.

Another recent collection of readings for undergraduates, *The College Quad*, also has included the "comics" broadcast plus the 1950 "Town Meeting" debate on, "What is the Difference Between Socialism and Social Welfare?" with Helen Gahagan Douglas, Herman Steinhaus, and Norman Thomas.

The discussion, "How Can We Secure Peace in a Hydrogen Bomb

"World?" heard in February, 1950, was chosen for the 13th edition in the significant series, *Representative American Speeches*, prepared by A. Craig Baird. About this program, in which Senator Brian McMahon and H. V. Kaltenborn participated, Mr. Baird wrote, "This Town Hall program is to be studied for the techniques of radio composition and for its demonstration of debating methods. The critic, judging the analysis, structure, language, audience adjustment, and refutation will attempt to answer the question, "Who won the debate?"

Three other texts, *Types and Technics in English Composition*, *Group Leadership and Democratic Action* and *Public Speaking*, use "Town Meeting" as an example of developing the issues in an argument and stimulating audience interest and participation.

Altogether different from the above is the book which has been enjoyed by many "Town Meeting" devotees, *The World We Saw*, written in 1950 by Mary Bell Decker. This is a revealing account of "Town Meeting's" World Tour in 1949 . . . the people-to-people visits in fifteen foreign capitals stretching from London to Honolulu.

On the lighter side, is a recent offering by Random House, *A New Leash on Life*, which makes "Town Meeting" an ingredient of canine fantasy. Written by Richard Grossman with pictures by Carl Rose, this is the tale of Herman Boxer, "soldier, scholar, citizen of the world—and dog." Among other events in a life filled with vicissitude, Herman, we are told, was allowed to defend himself on a Town Meeting of the Air debate, *Is America Going to the Dogs?*

Argumentation and Debate, James H. McBurney, James M. O'Neill, Glen E. Mills, The Macmillan Co., 1951

Readings for Opinion, edited by Earle Davis and William C. Hummel, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1952

The College Quad, edited by Edwin R. Clapp, Sydney W. Angleman and Hector H. Lee, William Sloane Associates, 1951

Representative American Speeches 1949-50, edited by A. Craig Baird, H. W. Wilson Co., 1950

Types and Technics in English Composition, Frederick A. Manchester, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951

Group Leadership and Democratic Action, Franklyn S. Haiman, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1951

Public Speaking, Giles Wilkeson Gray and Waldo W. Braden, Harper & Brothers, 1951

The World We Saw, Mary Bell Decker, Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1950

A New Leash on Life, Richard Grossman and Carl Rose, Random House, 1950